

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01759 01 OF 03 272026Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03

SS-20 USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14

OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /165 W
----- 057638

P R 271933Z FEB 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1779

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 VIENNA 1759

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP

MEETING, FEBRUARY 26, 1974

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. IN ITS MEETING ON 26 FEBRUARY THE
AHG, CHAIRED BY NETHERLAND REP QUARLES, COVERED THE
FOLLOWING AGENDA:

A. ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH EASTERN
REPS ON 26 FEB 1974 (VIENNA 1702). B. GREEK, 26
FEBRUARY BILATERAL WITH CZECH REP. C. BELGIAN, 26
FEBRUARY BILATERAL WITH SOVIET REP. D. AHG COMMENTS ON
GDR REP'S 26 FEBRUARY PLENARY STATEMENT (SEPTTEL).

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01759 01 OF 03 272026Z

E. DESIRABILITY OF ALLIED RESPONSE TO CONTINUED

EASTERN ACCUSATIONS THAT WEST IS VIOLATING AGREED COMMUNIQUE BY REFUSING TO CONSIDER REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS DURING FIRST PHASE NEGOTIATIONS. F. ALLIED POSITION ON SOVIET CATEGORIZATION OF FOREIGN AND NATIONAL FORCES. G. THE AHG CHAIRMAN REPORT TO THE NAC FOR THE PERIOD 18-22 FEB 74 (SEPTEL). H. COMPOSITION OF AHG REPRESENTATIVES TO BRIEF NAC ON 15 MARCH AND 5 APRIL. END SUMMARY.

2. THE AD HOC GROUP MEETING OPENED WITH A DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE INFORMAL CONFERENCE WITH WARSAW PACT DELEGATES HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY (VIENNA 1702). AS NATO SPOKESMAN AT THIS DISCUSSION, THE UK REP (ROSE) SUPPLEMENTED WRITTEN ACCOUNT NOTING THAT SOV REP (KHLESTOV) HAD ARGUED THAT NATO SHOULD NOT RAISE ASSOCIATED MEASURES UNTIL ROUND TWO. THE NATO REPS HAD CONTESTED THIS, POINTING OUT THAT THE WEST HAD NOT DETERMINED WHAT IT WANTS TO ADDRESS UNDER "OTHER TOPICS" AND DID NOT WANT TO GO INTO THESE DETAILS AT THIS TIME, BUT THE NATO REPS INSISTED THEIR RIGHT TO RAISE TOPICS OF THEIR CHOICE UNDER THIS HEADING. SECOND, AT THE SUGGESTION OF THE U.S. REP, THE CONFEREES HAD ACCEPTED THE FORMULATION OF SEVEN SESSIONS, AS OPPOSED TO A SPECIFIC NUMBER OF TOPICS AND ROUNDS. FURTHER, IT WAS AGREED THAT IF NEITHER SIDE DESIRED TO RAISE A TOPIC IN THE SEVENTH SESSION, DISCUSSION COULD RETURN TO THE FIRST POINT AND BEGIN A NEW ROUND.

3. THE UK REP FOLLOWED THESE POINTS BY PROVIDING AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONDUCT OF THE INFORMAL CONFERENCE. HE STATED THAT THE SOVIET REP'S IMMEDIATE RESPONSE TO THE NATO SPEAKING NOTES (WHICH THE UK REP HAD PRESENTED VERBATIM) WAS TO ACCUSE THE WEST OF ATTEMPTING TO REWRITE LAST WEEK'S CONCLUSIONS ENTIRELY. HOWEVER, WHEN THE UK REP ASKED FOR AN EXPLANATION, IT APPEARED THAT THE SOVIET REP'S ACCUSATION WAS A FACE-SAVING DEVICE. AS REGARDS TOPIC ONE, THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EAST AND WEST WERE RESOLVED QUICKLY. THE UK REP BELIEVED THAT A USEFUL POINT HAD BEEN GAINED WHEN THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01759 01 OF 03 272026Z

SOVIET REP CONFIRMED TWICE THAT THE FIRST SESSION WOULD DEAL EXCLUSIVELY WITH US/SOVIET GROUND FORCES, AND OTHER GROUND FORCES WOULD NOT BE DISCUSSED UNTIL THE SECOND SESSION AT THE EARLIEST. THE UK REP CONTINUED THAT ITEM TWO CAUSED A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFICULTY AT THE OUTSET; HOWEVER, HE BELIEVED IT HAD BEEN RESOLVED SATISFACTORILY FOR BOTH SIDES. AS UNDERSTOOD BY BOTH SIDES NOW, THE WARSAW PACT CAN

DISCUSS NUCLEAR AND AIR FORCES FOR THREE SESSIONS, WHILE THE WEST RETAINS THE UNEQUIVOCAL RIGHT TO RAISE TOPICS OF ITS INTEREST IN THE FINAL SESSION. THE SOVIETS HAD QUESTIONED UK REPS REFERENCE TO "DISCUSSIONS" OF ITEM ONE AS DISTINGUISHED FROM "RAISING OF POINT" UNDER ITEM TWO. THE SOVIET REP HAD ASKED WHY THERE COULD NOT BE ONE UNIFORM TERM FOR BOTH ITEMS. THE UK REP EXPLAINED THAT "DISCUSSIONS" CONNOTED A DIALOGUE AND HENCE AN AGREED TOPIC WHEREAS "RAISING A POINT" INDICATED THAT THERE WAS NO AGREEMENT ON THAT POINT AND HENCE NO ENSUING DISCUSSION. THIS ISSUE WAS RESOLVED BY THE UK REP'S COMMENT THAT THE WEST MIGHT "COMMENT" ON POINTS RAISED BY THE EAST AND THAT THIS WAS TANTAMOUNT TO DISCUSSION. THE UK REP CONCLUDED HIS ORAL REMARKS BY NOTING THAT THE INFORMAL SUGGESTION HE HAD RECEIVED EARLIER FROM GRD REP CONCERNING ALTERNATION OF TOPICS 1 AND 2 WAS NOT RAISED AT THE FEBRUARY 26 DISCUSSION.

4. NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) STATED THAT IN THE DAY'S MEETING HE HAD DETECTED A TENDENCY ON THE PART OF THE SOVIETS TO BLUR THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN DISCUSSIONS OF US/SOVIET GROUND FORCES AND THOSE OF NATIONAL FORCES. WHEN CALLED ON THIS POINT, THE SOVDEPREP STATED THAT THE WEST'S INTERPRETATION PUT A "WHOLE NEW VIEW" ON THIS TOPIC. HOWEVER, WHEN REMINDED THAT THE SOVIET REP HAD AGREED ON 20 FEBRUARY TO THE DEFINITE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THESE CATEGORIES, THE SOV REPS

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01759 02 OF 03 272044Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03

SS-20 USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14

OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /165 W

----- 057797

P R 271933Z FEB 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1780
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 VIENNA 1759

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

BACKED DOWN. THE NETHERLANDS REP CONTINUED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NONETHELESS BE AWARE OF THE PACT'S TENDENCIES TO BLUR THIS DISTINCTION. HE FELT THAT THE SOVIETS WERE ATTEMPTING TO RECTIFY THEIR TACTICAL ERROR IN CONCEDING TO THIS DIVISION OF SUBJECTS DURING THE 20 FEBRUARY MEETING.

5. NETHERLANDS REP EXPRESSED VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT BRING UP ASSOCIATED MEASURES UNDER "OTHER TOPICS." HE STATED THAT THE "OTHER TOPICS" ITEM IS FOR THOSE SUBJECTS WHICH ARE NOT COMMON GROUND; BUT THAT AS ASSOCIATED MEASURES ARE AGREED IN THE 28 JUNE 9173 COMMUNIQUE, THE EAST CANNOT REFUSE TO DISCUSS THEM. THE NETHERLANDS REP SUGGESTED THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT TRY FOR A NUMBER OF SESSIONS ON ASSOCIATED MEASURES LATER IN THE SERIES OF INFORMAL MEETINGS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01759 02 OF 03 272044Z

6. IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS BY CANADIAN REP (GRANDE), THE UK REP PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING AMPLIFICATIONS: ONE, IF THE WEST WISHES, IT CAN DISCUSS US AND SOVIET FORCES IN THE SECOND AND THIRD SESSIONS. TWO, BOTH SIDES WILL BE FREE TO RAISE TOPICS IN THE SEVENTH SESSION. THERE IS NO ONE-TOPIC RESTRICTION IN THAT SESSION. AND THREE, THE SUBJECT OF SCHEDULING OR RHYTHM OF THE INFORMAL SESSIONS WAS NOT RAISED ON 26 FEBRUARY. THERE WILL BE ANOTHER INFORMAL SESSION ON 27 FEBRUARY AT WHICH TIME THE SCHEDULE FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK WILL BE LAID OUT.

7. THE ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) STATED THAT ALLIES MUST LOOK AT RESULTS WITH OBJECTIVITY. SPECIFICALLY, THERE WERE ONE AND ONE-HALF SESSIONS ON WESTERN SUBJECTS, AND FIVE AND ONE-HALF ON EASTERN SUBJECTS. THIS WAS NOT A FAVORABLE RATIO. FURTHER, THREE SESSIONS IN A ROW TO DISCUSS NUCLEAR AND AIR FORCES WAS EXCESSIVE FOR A SUBJECT WITH WHICH NATO COMPLETELY DISAGREES. THE

ITALIAN REP CONCLUDED WITH THE ADMONITION THAT THE NATO REPS MUST NOT ALLOW THEMSELVES TO BE DRAWN INTO SERIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF POINTS UPON WHICH THEY DID NOT AGREE. THEY COULD COMMENT, BUT NOT DISCUSS.

8. THE BELGIAN REP (ADRIAENSSEN) STATED THAT HE AGREED WITH THE ITALIAN REP WITH REFERENCE TO OBJECTIVITY AND THE NEED TO AVOID DISCUSSION OF NON-AGREED SUBJECT AREAS. HE ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT JUDGMENT ON THE SUCCESS OF WHAT HAD BEEN ACCOMPLISHED WOULD HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL AT LEAST AFTER THE FIRST SEVEN SESSIONS. SOME OF THESE SESSIONS MAY BE VERY SHORT AND OTHERS MAY BE VERY LONG. THE FRG REP (BEHREND) AGREED THAT THE AHG CANNOT PASS JUDGMENT UNTIL IT HAS SEEN THE RESULTS OF AT LEAST THE FIRST ROUND. HE SUGGESTED THAT PERHAPS ALLIES SHOULD HAVE SOUGHT AGREEMENT MERELY ON THREE SESSIONS ON SUBJECTS TO BE CHOSEN BY WEST TO BE FOLLOWED BY THREE SESSIONS ON SUBJECTS TO BE CHOSEN BY THE WARSAW PACT. HOWEVER, THIS WAS HINDSIGHT AND, AT THIS POINT, THE ALLIES SHOULD LOOK AT PROGRESS AFTER THE FIRST SEVEN SESSIONS AND DETERMINE WHETHER THE FORMAT OR SEQUENCE SHOULD
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01759 02 OF 03 272044Z

CHANGE, AND IF SO, HOW. THE UK REP ADDED THAT THE SPEAKING NOTES USED IN THE 16 FEBRUARY CONFERENCE SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED FOR THE POSSIBILITY OF REVISING THE FORMAT OF THE SESSIONS. HE ALSO STATED THAT THERE WAS NO BAR TO HAVING FURTHER SESSIONS DEVOTED EXCLUSIVELY TO ASSOCIATED MEASURES. THE CHAIRMAN CONCLUDED THIS PORTION OF THE DISCUSSIONS BY STATING THAT THE MAIN TASK OF THE NATO REPS WAS TO INSURE THAT THE SESSIONS ON NATO SUBJECTS WERE PRODUCTIVE, AND PROPOSING THAT THE WESTERN REPS FOR THE NEXT INFORMAL MEETING BE THE DELEGATES FROM THE US, THE FRG AND THE NETHERLANDS. THE AD HOC GROUP CONCURRED IN THIS RECOMMENDATION.

BILATERALS

9. GREEK REP (DOUNTAS) REPORTED THAT PRIOR TO 26 FEBRUARY PLENARY HE HAD BEEN APPROACHED BY CZECH REP (KLEIN) WHO HAD ASKED WHAT ALLIES REALLY WANTED IN REGARD TO FLANK COUNTRIES. GREEK REP ANSWERED THE NEGOTIATIONS HAVE NOT REACHED THE STATE WHERE SUCH DETAIL HAD BEEN WORKED OUT BUT THAT THE ALLIES WOULD BE PREPARED TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE IN DETAIL AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE GREEK REP MENTIONED THAT THIS WAS THE SECOND TIME HE HAD BEEN ASKED THIS QUESTION, THE FIRST TIME BY KHLESTOV.

10. THE BELGIAN REP REPORTED THAT IN A BRIEF EXCHANGE OF COMMENTS AFTER THE PLENARY ON 26 FEBRUARY, THE SOV REP HAD ASKED HIM WHETHER HE HAD NOTICED THE EMPHASIS IN THE PLENARY STATEMENT ON SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS, AND WHAT HIS REACTION WAS TO THIS CONCEPT. THE BELGIAN REP HAD REPLIED THAT IF THE SOV REP WAS SPEAKING OF REDUCTIONS AS ENVISIONED IN THE EASTERN PROPOSAL, THESE WERE NOT SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS. FURTHER, THE BELGIAN REP CHALLENGED THE STATEMENTS MADE IN THE 26 FEBRUARY PLENARY PRESENTATION THAT SUCH SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS COULD BE SIMPLE AND UNCOMPLICATED. THE SOV REP HAD REPLIED THAT HE WAS NOT REFERRING TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL AS IT STOOD BUT RATHER TO THE CONCEPT OF SOME SIMPLE AND UNCOMPLICATED REDUCTIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 01759 02 OF 03 272044Z

THE BELGIAN REP SAID THAT THE SOV REP GAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS WERE VERY IMPORTANT TO HIM. THE BELGIAN REP SAID SOV REP'S CONCLUDING REMARK WAS
E E E E E E E

ADP000

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01759 03 OF 03 272112Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03

SS-20 USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14

OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /165 W

----- 058214

P R 271933Z FEB 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1781

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 VIENNA 1759

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

FRG REP ALSO POINTED OUT THAT GDR STATEMENT CONTAINED AN INDIRECT REFERENCE TO THE SECURITY OF THE FLANK COUNTRIES, AND IMPLIED THAT THIS WOULD BE AUTOMATICALLY MAINTAINED IF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS REDUCED THEIR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

13. GREEK REP STATED THAT HE CONCURRED WITH FRG REP'S COMMENTS, NOTING THAT IT WAS THE SECOND TIME THAT THE SECURITY OF THE SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS HAD BEEN MENTIONED: THREE MONTHS AGO THE BULGARIAN AMBASSADOR HAD INFORMED THE GREEK REP THAT BULGARIA WAS IN COMPLETE AGREEMENT WITH WESTERN CONCERNS FOR THE SECURITY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01759 03 OF 03 272112Z

PROPOSED RESPONSE TO EASTERN ACCUSATION THAT WEST IS VIOLATING AGREED COMMUNIQUE CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS

14. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT, SO FAR, ALLIES HAD NOT REPLIED TO THE REPEATED EASTERN ACCUSATIONS THAT WESTERN EUROPEAN ALLIES WERE VIOLATING THE AGREED 28 JUNE 1973 COMMUNIQUE BY NOT COMMITTING THEMSELVES TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES FROM THE OUTSET. THE ACCUSATION IMPLIED THAT ALLIES WERE KEEPING THEIR OPTION OPEN TO INCREASE THEIR FORCES IN THE AREA OF NEGOTIATION BY NOT REDUCING IN THE FIRST PLACE. SINCE THESE ACCUSATIONS WERE BEING REPEATED OVER AND OVER AGAIN, THE TIME HAD COME TO FORMULATE A REPLY. AN ANSWER MUST BE MADE TO THIS ACCUSATION BECAUSE IT WAS PROBABLY GOING TO BE PUBLICIZED. THE AD HOC GROUP SHOULD AGREE ON HOW TO DEAL WITH IT AND WHAT LANGUAGE TO USE. UK REP ANSWERED THAT HIS DELEGATION HAD BEEN DEVELOPING A TEXT OF A FORMAL STATEMENT COVERING THIS TOPIC WHICH HE WOULD BE PREPARED TO CIRCULATE. CANADIAN REP WELCOMED UK REP'S PROPOSAL AND ASKED THAT UK FORMULATION BE CIRCULATED FOR AD HOC GROUP'S CONSIDERATION. HE CAUTIONED, HOWEVER, THAT IN DISCUSSING THIS SUBJECT WITH THE EAST, IT WILL BE DIFFICULT TO KNOW HOW FAR THE MEMBERS OF THE AHG CAN GO, EITHER AS REPS OR AS INDIVIDUALS, WITHOUT HAVING TO CONSULT THEIR GOVERNMENTS. HE HOPED THAT THE AHG COULD WORK OUT SOME SATISFACTORY GENERAL FORMULATION.

DISCUSSION OF SOVIET CATEGORIZATION OF FOREIGN AND NATIONAL FORCES

15. UK REP THEN ADDRESSED THE USE OF A RECURRING PHRASE IN EASTERN STATEMENTS WHICH CATEGORIZED FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA AS FOREIGN AND NATIONAL. HE STRESSED THAT THE USE OF SUCH A CATEGORIZATION MUST BE RESISTED AND ALLIES SHOULD BE CAREFUL NOT TO SLIDE INTO THIS TRAP. THE APPROVED CATEGORIZATION OF FORCES, WHICH THE ALLIES SHOULD INSIST ON WAS US/SOVIET AND THE FORCES OF OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. IF THE SOVIET'S DEFINITION WERE TO BE USED, THE ALLIES

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01759 03 OF 03 272112Z

WOULD RUN THE RISK THAT ALL THE FORCE IN THE REDUCTION AREA WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE GERMAN FORCES, WHICH WOULD BE KNOWN AS NATIONAL FORCES, WOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS FOREIGN. THIS CLASSIFICATION WOULD LEAD TO GREAT PROBLEMS REGARDING WHICH FORCES WERE TO BE WITHDRAWN AND WHICH WERE TO BE DISBANDED, AND COULD ALSO LEAD TO IMPOSITION OF SUB-CEILINGS. US DEP REP CONCURRED WITH UK REP AND STRESSED THAT THE ONLY TERMINOLOGY OFFICIALLY AGREED WITH EAST WAS "FORCES OF POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS."

16 THE ITALIAN REP CONCURRED WITH THE UK REP AND STATED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD MAKE IT PARTICULARLY CLEAR TO THE SOVIETS, PERHAPS AT THE NEXT MEETING THAT THE ALLIES WILL NOT ACCEPT CATEGORIZATION INTO NATIONAL AND FOREIGN FORCES. THE ITALIAN REP THEN ASKED WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT THE RECURRING EMPHASIS ON A POSSIBLE FORCE FREEZE BETWEEN MBFR PHASES. HE PERSONALLY FELT THAT THE AHG SHOULD AVOID DISCUSSION OF THIS QUESTION AT THIS TIME BECAUSE THEY HAD NO AUTHORITY TO DO SO FROM EITHER THE NAC OR THEIR NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS. IN ANY EVENT, HE BELIEVED THAT IF NATO EVENTUALLY DECIDED TO USE A FORCE FREEZE, IT SHOULD BE DONE NEAR THE END OF THE NEGOTIATIONS PHASE IN ORDER TO GET THE MAXIMUM ADVANTAGE OUT OF SUCH A CONCESSION. THE NETHERLANDS REP SUPPORTED THIS POSITION, STRESSING THAT THE QUESTION OF A FORCE FREEZE COULD BE A VERY IMPORTANT NEGOTIATING CHIP AND THAT AN ALLIANCE POSITION IN THIS REGARD SHOULD BE PREPARED IN ADVANCE. THE ITALIAN REP RESPONDED THAT PERHAPS THE EASIEST ANSWER FOR THE MOMENT WOULD BE TO POINT OUT TO THE EAST THAT NO FREEZE WAS REQUIRED ON NATO FORCES BECAUSE IN THE PAST SIX YEARS WARSAW PACT FORCES HAD INCREASED BY MORE THAN 25 PCT WHEREAS THOSE OF THE WEST HAD REMAINED RELATIVELY STABLE.

AD HOC CHEIRMAN'S WEEKLY REPORT, AND OTHER ITEMS

17. AD HOC GROUP APPROVED THE CHAIRMAN'S WEEKLY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 01759 03 OF 03 272112Z

REPORT WHICH HAD BEEN CIRCULATED BY THE ITALIAN REP
(TEXT FORWARDED SEPTTEL).

18. US DEP REP SUGGESTED AND AD HOC GROUP APPROVED
SELECTION OF UK REP AS GROUP'S REP TO INFORM
ROMANIAN REP ON STATUS OF INFORMAL MEETINGS BETWEEN
WESTERN AND EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES. ROMANIANS WILL
BE INFORMED TOMORROW AFTERNOON AND UK REP WILL IN-
FORMALLY COVER AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING 27 FEBRUARY
INFORMAL MEETING.

19. US REP THEN SUGGESTED THAT, IN ORDER TO ALLOW FOR
SUFFICIENT PREPARATION TIME ON PART OF AD HOC GROUP,
MONDAY AND THURSDAY AFTERNOONS BE AGREED ON FOR THE IN-
FORMAL SESSIONS WITH THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES. AD
HOC GROUP DECIDED TO DEFER FINAL DECISION ON THIS
SUGGESTION UNTIL THE ALLIED REPS MADE SOME EFFORT TO
GET NUMBER OF PLENARIES REDUCED FROM TWO TO TO ONCE A WEEK.
AHG, AT US DEP REP'S SUGGESTION, ALSO AGREED TO REFER
TO MEETINGS WITH EASTERN REPS AS "INFORMAL SESSIONS
WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES."

20. CANADIAN REP ADDRESSED COMPOSITION OF AD HOC GROUP
REPRESENTATIVES WHO WOULD REPRESENT THE GROUP IN THE
ORAL PRESENTATIONS TO THE NAC. HE SUGGESTED AND AD
HOC GROUP AGREED THAT THE MARCH 15 BRIEFING TO THE NAC
BE CONDUCTED BY FRG AMBASSADOR BEHRENDT WHO WOULD BE
ACCOMPANIED BY THE NORWEGIAN AND NETHERLAND REPS. AD
HOC GROUP FURTHER AGREED THAT THE BRIEFING TO NAC ON
5 APRIL SHOULD BE GIVEN BY THE US REP ACCOMPANIED BY
THE TURKISH AND BELGIAN REPS.

21. NEXT AD HOC GROUP MEETING WAS SCHEDULED FOR 27
FEBRUARY. HUMES

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DISARMAMENT, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, NEGOTIATIONS, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974VIENNA01759
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t1974024/aaaaadvq.tel
Line Count: 480
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 22 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <22 MAR 2002 by worrelsw>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING, FEBRUARY 26, 1974
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005